Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/790,240	NINOMIYA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John S. Maples	1795
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) John S. Maples.	(3)	
(2) Christophe Lair.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 26 May 2009.		
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☑ No. If Yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed: of record.		
Identification of prior art discussed: none.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: the <u>attorney showed the examiner and stated that claims 5-10 should have been</u> included in the total claims allowed because they were subject to an election of seceier senterment and with the generic claim being allowed. These claims would be allowable also. The examiner agreed and is allowing claims 5-10 also.		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCS OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04) Is a reply to the last Office action has already been fled. APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THRITY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAIL MOD ATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements or reverse side or on attached sheet.		